

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 14 remain in this application. Previous claims 1 - 14 are rejected. Claims 3, 8, and 11 are cancelled herein. Claims 1, 2, 4 - 7, 9, 10, and 12 - 14 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to express the invention in alternative wording, and to attend to other formal matters that were not addressed by the Examiner and accordingly are considered unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to because the original filed abstract was too lengthy. The Examiner requested that an abstract not longer than 150 words be submitted.

An new abstract, replacing the original abstract, and conforming to the requirement of same is submitted herewith to overcome the Examiner's basis for objection.

In the Office Action, claim 14 was objected to because in previous claim 14, at lines 6 - 7 thereof, because the phrase "the identification information" should read "identification information"; and in claim 14, line 11, the phrase "the received data" should be "received data".

The bases for objection to previous claim 14 are overcome by the amendment of that claim, as presented herein above.

In the Office Action, previous claims 1, 2, and 4 - 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable for obviousness over U.S. Patent 6,175,784 to Jicha et al ("Jicha et al").

The Examiner contends that Jicha et al discloses a system for remote-controlling a drive, substantially as taught according to previous claims 1 and 2 of the present application.

In particular, the Examiner maintains that the system disclosed in Jicha et al includes a transmitter that generates identification information and operation control information, and that transmits the data using a transmission device (reference at col, 7, lines 45 - 62; col. 5, lines 49 - 67; and col. 6, lines 1 - 3).

Furthermore, the Examiner states that Jicha et al includes a drive which includes: a reception device, a storage device, a first discrimination device, for discriminating whether the received data is for operation control or for changing the identification information, and a second discrimination device for comparing the identification information with stored identification information, a control device for executing the operation control, and an identification change device for changing the the identification information stored in the storage device (reference at col. 4, lines 7 - 15; col. 7, lines 45 -67; col. 8, lines 1 - 3; and col. 11, lines 8 - 17)

The Examiner recognizes that Jicha et al does not explicitly teach, disclose, or suggest providing discrimination information.

The Examiner further contends, however, that Jicha et al discloses providing controlling operation which indicates a change in identification information or a command of operation (reference at col. 7, lines 45 - 62; col. 8, lines 1 - 3).

The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to separate the input

command of Jicha et al into separate operation control information and discrimination information, since separating a command into different data information according to the allocated length of the message and complexity of the command, requires only routine skill in the art.

With regard to previous claims 4 and 5 of the present application, the Examiner contends that the acceptance and changing of information when such information meets a specific condition, and storing data in a non-volatile memory would have been know in the art at the time the present invention was made.

With regard to previous claims 6 - 11 of the present application, the Examiner restated the arguments made with regard to previous claims 1 - 3 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's analysis of Jicha et al, and the conclusion of obviousness of the claims of the present application made in view thereof. The Examiner's rejection is traversed based on the following arguments.

In view of the amendments to the claims made herein, the following arguments are made in view of those amendments.

The following is a comparison of the invention according to currently amended claim 1 of the present application (hereinafter "the present invention") to the invention disclosed in Jicha et al.

Some of the principal features of the device according to the present invention are as follows:

A. identification information data, which includes transmitter-specifying information data for distinguishing a particular transmitter from among a plurality

of transmitters, and drive-specifying information data for distinguishing a particular drive from among plurality of drives;

B. a data generator of the transmitter, which can independently change each of the transmitter-specifying information data and the drive-specifying information data included in the data to be transmitted in accordance with operation of an input unit performed by a user;

C. a second discriminator of the drive, which discriminates that received data is the data transmitted to the drive, when the transmitter-specifying information data and the drive-specifying information data, included in the received data, coincide with the transmitter-specifying information data and the drive-specifying information data stored in a data storage; and

D. an identification-information changer of the drive, which changes the transmitter-specifying information data and the drive-specifying information data, which is stored in the data storage device in accordance with the transmitter-specifying information data and the drive-specifying information data included in the data discriminated as the data for the change of identification information.

Because of the presence of the above features A and C, a drive is discriminated by the transmitter-specifying information data and the drive-specifying information data. Accordingly, each drive can be associated with only one transmitter at a given time, according to the transmitter-specifying information data which is stored in the drive.

Therefore, the present invention is efficient especially for a remote-controlled system which has plural sets of one transmitter and plural drives controlled by the transmitter.

Moreover, because of the presence of features B and D in the device of the present invention,, the relationship between transmitters and drives can be changed freely and easily, without having to substitute different hardware components.

Furthermore, if the kinds of transmitter-specifying information data are limited, such as by changing the transmitter-specifying information data of the transmitter, various transmitters become available.

Jicha et al discloses a remote-controlled system, which only includes HSRM12 and rail cars (corresponding to the drives of the present invention), and HDT14 (corresponding to the transmitter of the present invention). Jicha et al fails to teach or disclose the use of a plurality of transmitters, or the capability of discriminating as to one selected transmitter from among the plurality.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Jicha et al does not render obvious the subject matter of any of amended claims 1 - 14 of the present application, as amended by this Amendment.

Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of previous claims 1, 2, and 4 - 11 of the present application, and not reapply that

rejection to any of amended claims 1, 3, 4 - 7, 9, 10, and 12 - 14 in the application after entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, previous claims 3, and 12 - 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable for obviousness over Jicha et al, in view of U.S. Patent 6,037,858 to Seki ("Seki").

The Examiner contends that Jicha et al discloses the capability of changing stored identification information according to the user's input, and the use of a second discrimination unit for discriminating a message being transmitted to a specified drive (reference at col. 7, lines 45 - 67; and col. 8, lines 1 - 3), substantially as is taught according to previous claim 3 of the present application..

The Examiner further contends that Seki discloses the use of a plurality of transmitters with the capability of distinguishing a selected transmitter from among the plurality, as well as the capability of changing the transmitter specifying information data (reference at col. 6, lines 52 - 65; and col. 7 - col 8, lines 1 - 57).

The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to a person or ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made, to include a plurality of transmitters in the system of Jicha et al, to store the transmitter identification information to a storage device in each of a plurality of drives, and to include the capability of recognition of a specific transmitter and a specific

drive to communicate with one another in order to facilitate communication and control of a plurality of transmitters with a plurality of drives.

With regard to previous claims 12 - 14 of the present application, the Examiner restated the same arguments made above in accordance with previous claims 1 and 3 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's analysis of the aforesaid combination of references and the conclusion of unpatentability of previous claims 3 and 12 - 14 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being obvious thereover. The Examiner's rejection is traversed based on the following arguments.

Seki discloses a remote-controlled system which includes a plurality of transmitters and a single receiver (a drive). Seki discloses the use of identification information, including an ID code and a variable code. Both of these codes, however, represent transmitter-specifying information data of the present application.

The ID code is the code intrinsic to the transmitter (reference at col. 6 lines 55-56), and the variable code is the code for discriminating a proper signal as well as the ID code (reference at col. 5 lines 26-33).

Moreover, according to Seki, all of the ID codes of the transmitters must be stored in the drive to control the drive. Each of the ID codes is intrinsic to each of the transmitters, and Seki fails to teach or disclose a method of changing the

contents of ID code of a specific transmitter. Seki discloses an ID code write mode, but the mode is for changing only the kinds of stored ID codes.

Therefore, a device arrived at by combining Jicha et al and Seki is a remote controlled system where a drive can be controlled by plural transmitters, the ID codes of which are stored in the drive. Moreover, the ID code, once set to a certain transmitter cannot be changed. They are for storing all kinds of ID codes, and must be prepared in the drive. Every time a new transmitter is added, all ID codes of the transmitters including the new one, corresponding to the associated driver, must be rewritten in the ID code write mode.

There is no way by which it is possible that both a remote controlled system having plural sets, each of which has one transmitter and a plurality of drives, and a construction whereby the ID codes themselves can be changed, or having the elements of the device of the present application, described herein above in A - D, can be deemed to result from a combination of the disclosure in Jicha et al and Seki.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the device according to the present application, as recited according to the amended claim presented herein, is not obvious over Jicha et al in view of Seki. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of previous claims 3, and 12 - 14 of the present application, and not reapply that rejection to any of amended claims 1, 3, 4 - 7, 9, 10, and 12 - 14 in the application after entry of this Amendment.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited

No additional claims fees are incurred as a result of the amendments to the claims presented herein.

An Information Disclosure Statement, listing four additional Japanese Patent references, of which applicants are aware, is being filed herewith.

This Amendment is being filed within the original three month shortened statutory period for response. Accordingly, a request for an extension of time is not required, and no fee for an extension of time is presently due.

No other fees are believed due with the filing of this Amendment, however, if any additional fees should be due, or if any overpayments have been made, they should be respectively charged and credited to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,

JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan

Frank J. Jordan

Reg. No. 20,456

Attorney for Applicants

by Howard R. Jaeger

Howard R. Jaeger

Reg. No. 91,976

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340